E03614

The Proposed Mohamedan University.

BEING

An Address delivered at the Bombay Presidency Mohamedan Educational Conference, at Ahmedabad, on 16th October, 1904,

BY

MOHAMED ALI, B.A., (Oxon),

(Formerly of the Mohamedan Anglo-Oriental College of Aligarh, and of Lincoln College, Oxford.)

Bombay:
CAXTON PRINTING WORKS.
1904.

TO

ALIGARH MEMORIES.

"Haec olim meminisse juvabit."

—Virgil.

THE PROPOSED MOHAMEDAN UNIVERSITY.

"THE Catholic faith," said Bernard, saint and philosopher of the Middle Ages, "is discussed in the market-place. Truly we have fallen on evil times." The followers of the late Sir Syed Ahmad Khan of Aligarh have long cherished the scheme of a Mohamedan University for India, have passed in their Conference unanimous resolutions accepting the proposal, have delivered eloquent addresses in its support, filled the columns of Indian journals with arguments in its favour, and even parted with sums of money quite large for a poor people like the Mosalmans, and so unpopular a cause as modern education, in order to bring such a University into existence. After all this, is it rational, is it necessary, or is it even politic to eschew all discussion of its need, to look upon all critics as mild imbeciles, if not "shady characters," and in the spirit of St. Bernard, to bemoan the evil times when their cherished scheme is desecrated by open discussion in the market-place ?

Whatever may have been the needs of the Catholic faith in the days of St. Bernard, we who live in the twentieth century, with its fierce light that beats on all, could not possibly desire to evade discussion and desecration, for the simple reason that we cannot. It would be humiliating to suppose that we have not yet outgrown the prudence of the ostrich, who is happy in the belief that no one sees him because his own neck is buried in the sand. Evasion of criticism is clearly not possible ; and what is not possible is as clearly not desirable. There has, moreover, grown up from inside the four walls of Aligarh a school of young Mosalmans whom their education has as least taught the lesson that popular institutions thrive best in open air. And Aligarh is not, like other educational institutions in Eastern countries, the result of the indifferent charity of an autocrat who could utter the *fiat* "Let there be Aligarh," with the cool assurance of omnipotence that before long there would be an Aligarh. Aligarh is the people's very own. How can it think, then, that popular breath would desecrate its sacrosanct character ?

In the light of these facts, it is hard to conceive the reason why in the last All India Mohamedan Educational Conference at Bombay Mr. A. Hydari was not allowed to offer the criticism which he has, after more than seven months, published in the August issue of *East & West*. Practical considerations, which the hot red blood of youth so often ignores, may have influenced the Secretary of the Conference if he requested Mr. Hydari to withhold his criticism. But it seems to me that the most practical consideration is this, that criticism acquires an adventitious force when evaded, even if the critic does not acquire an undesirable self-consciousness, and self-complacency. Nothing but "poor human nature" is to blame if authors are enamoured of their creations, and we should not be surprised if a critic who hears nothing in reply but the echo of his own voice concludes that his criticism was unanswerable. It is short-sightedness and folly to be annoyed with criticism, or to consider it in all cases unworthy of discussion. We, the Mosalmans of India, would betray our failure to grasp the spirit of these liberal, rational, and therefore "critical" times, if we regarded every critic as an enemy. That mistake, is, however, not likely to be made in the case of Mr. Hydari, for he is not only one of our own number, but a friend of higher education. But I submit that we should not fall into Scylla in avoiding Charybdis, and regard every lover of a paradox, and every champion of a specious fallacy, as that "heroic minority of one," with which every great reform has begun. Every one can demand a hearing, but not all can command our credulity.

So much for a preface. Before entering into the full discussion of this great question, I shall deal with a general misunderstanding. Many people in India seem to regard the proposal of a Mohamedan University as a sort of impromptu enterprise of a few misguided guides of our race. The zeal,—and, I must confess with a certain amount of humiliation, the effervescent zeal—with which the proposal was advocated shortly after the death of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan in 1898, has led people to believe that the proposal was unpremeditated, and that calculating wire-pullers gauged the feelings of the people on the death of a great leader, and found the time a fitting one to spring upon the Mosalmans a scheme, which has not yet been given an opportunity, so to speak, of being "found out." This, I must submit, is a grave misapprehension. We may or may

not agree with the distinguished Bilgrami's assertion that "we are only continuing on the banks of the Ganges what we began more than thirteen centuries ago on the banks of the Euphrates." But we are on the firmer ground of facts, verifiable by reference to day, month, and year, when we read in a Circular Letter of the late Mr. Justice Mahmood, addressed to the trustees of the Aligarh College, whose Secretary he became on the death of his father, that so long ago as the 10th of February, 1873, he submitted at Benares a scheme, rich in details, for the creations of a Mohamedan University. Four years later, when Lord Lytton came to Aligarh to lay the foundation stone of the Mohamedan Anglo-Oriental College, only a week after the Imperial Assemblage at Delhi, an address was presented to His Excellency. After recounting the motives of the founders of the College, the address runs as follows :—

> "And looking at the difficulties which stood in our way, and the success which has already been achieved, we do not doubt that we shall continue to receive, even in a larger measure, both from the English Government, and from our own countrymen, that liberal support which has furthered our scheme, so that from the seed which we sow to-day there may spring up a mighty tree whose branches, like those of the banyan of the soil, shall in their turn strike firm roots into the earth, and themselves send forth new and vigorous saplings; **that this College may expand into a University, whose sons shall go forth throughout the length and breadth of the land to preach the gospel of free enquiry, of large-hearted toleration, and of a pure morality.**

These expressive words, which give a brief outline of the original and fundamental principles of the aims, objects, and policy of the Mohamedan Anglo-Oriental College, have not been left dependent on the fleeting existence of parchment or paper, nor do they lie buried in the accumulating dust of many years as part of the day to day record of an educational institution. They meet the curious gaze of every visitor who enters the College Hall where knowledge has been disseminated, where sonorous eloquence has moved many audiences, and where the sounds of mirth have re-echoed on nights consecrated to the gaieties of refined youth. Deep cut in stone they are there for all the world to see, to quicken the pulse of age, and sober the exuberant pleasures of youth ; as well

a warning to those who enter upon a wearying work with an ill-befitting light-heartedness, and a mistaken belief that the path of the worker is rose-strewn, as an encouragement to the weary worker that the seed of knowledge is self-productive, and a clear declaration to all of the liberal and tolerant aims and policy of that institution, and of the greatness of its ultimate destiny.

Shall we believe that the cold stone on which these memorable words are inscribed has remained silent and unresponsive since first these words were cut into it? Can it be possible that it has inspired not a single heart, encouraged no flagging spirit, pointed to no weary traveller the goal which alone should be his destination? Did the people, whose sentiments it perpetuates, forget their own cherished ideal after years of toil and trouble? The low-water mark of prosperity was reached in the year 1897, when Sir Syed Ahmed greeted Lord Elgin on the threshold of the College, and the Trustees assembled in the great hall, under the shadow of a great monetary loss, through embezzlement, that hurried their leader to the grave. Yet, after summing up the history of the College, and striking a balance between failure and success, the address presented to Lord Elgin went on to say,

> "The College has, during 22 years of its existence, made much greater progress in members, in buildings, and in reputation, than we ventured to hope. It is still, however, very far from the attainment of the ultimate end we have set before us, and of which we cannot hope to live to see the foundation in India, **viz. of a University for the Mohamedans of India, similar to the great English universities of Oxford and Cambridge.**"

Aligarh, with its ruined finances in 1897, and the dreams of an Islamic Oxford for India! Was it senile imbecility, or after all, was it the heroic tenacity of purpose, and greatness of mind, which refused to be satisfied with a lower ideal, simply because there were formidable difficulties in the way of the attainment of the higher, and little hope of the worker living long enough to enjoy the restfulness of success?

This University scheme is, therefore, nothing new. If its advocates took advantage of the excited state of public feeling on the passing away of a great leader, it is in no wise a case of mean opportunism. If it is, it will be perhaps the first instance in the

history of the affairs of men when the adaptation of means to the end is regarded a sin. The services of Syed Ahmed Khan not only to the cause of enlightenment or culture of one race or community, but to the cause of the peace of all the races of India, and their alien rulers, at a time when the echoes of war and rebellion had not totally subsided, required a monument. And what could be a more fitting memorial than the University of his life-long dreams, and death-bed hopes and injunctions? An English Collector of a District in the United Provinces said in support of the scheme:

> "A memorial should be *lasting*. A University lives for ever. A memorial should be *widely known*. A University extends its influence in all directions through the length and breadth of the land. A memorial should be *appropriate* to the person whose memory it preserves. The Aligarh College was the tangible outcome of Sir Syed's life-work, and nothing could more fitly enshrine his name than its association with an Aligarh University. A memorial should be *an object of public utility*. The Aligarh College, as we have seen, has been eminently useful, and there is little doubt that raising its status will tend to widen the sphere of its utility. Therefore, from all points, whether considered as *lasting*, or *widely known*, or *appropriate*, or *useful*, the character of the memorial selected by the leaders of the Mohamedan community could hardly be improved upon."

And we must remember, this is not the opinion of a Mosalman fanatic, or an interested one-idea man from Aligarh. It is the expression of the views of an Englishman, whose education in the catholic surroundings of Great Britain, has made it impossible for him to give his support to sectarianism.

But it is not only the views of one or more Indians or Englishmen of which we are enamoured. We would, even if we had no views of our own on the subject, and no English supporter of catholic sympathies, willingly have ourselves carried, bound hand and foot, to any destination, no matter how far or how difficult of access, simply because we have learnt in our contact with "the great man who had for over a quarter of a century woven a more potent spell over the imagination, and exercised a more powerful influence over the actions," of his co-religionists, than any other leader of any community, to confide not only in the sincerity of heart, which com-

pelled homage even from enemies, but in the infallibility of a judgment, which astounded even astute politicians and educationists, by its success in the long run in all that concerned the practical life of men. The scheme which has been advocated by us bears the stamp of Sir Syed Ahmad's judgment, and our confidence in that judgment has been such that we are ready to say with the poet,

رشته در گردنم افگنده دوست
مي برد هرجا که خاطرخواه اوست

Those who knew Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, and even those who have made a careful study of his Life by Hali, realise clearly that he was not a man with only one idea. There was no branch of the affairs of men, be it Religion, Politics, Education, or Literature, in which he did not take a deep and active interest. After a careful study of men and things and books, after a long and eventful life which bridged the gulf between two orders of things, the Old and the New, after many practical experiments with a view to diagnose the disease of his countrymen and especially of his co-religionists, and provide for it a suitable remedy, he resolved upon creating in India a University, not of the existing type of Indian Universities, but like the typical English institutions of Oxford and Cambridge, where he found, during his visit to Europe, the future statesmen, generals, and poets of England, unconsciously shaping their own destinies, and perhaps the destines of more than one country, in the lecture rooms of Balliol, and the chapel of King's, on Fenner's cricket ground, and the shady backwaters of the Cherwell. It is, therefore, not so much as a memorial to the great man to whom we owe our existence to-day as an important and respected portion of the Indian Empire, as on account of its being the culmination of Sir Syed Ahmad's life-long efforts, that we are attached to the idea of a Mohamedan University.

It is, moreover, an undoubted fact that a College such as that at Aligarh, designed to benefit, not exclusively, but mainly, a particular community, attracts to itself and draws towards education, a far greater number of men than the Government Colleges, where no special encouragement is given to any particular community, or those educational institutions in which motives of proselytisation are consciously or unconsciously mixed with those which desire the spread of knowledge. A University which would offer special

fatilities to the Mohamedan students, which our present Universities cannot justly do, would draw towards the centre of learning many a scholar whose parents would otherwise have doomed him to utter ignorance. Not so very long ago I found myself in the difficult situation of one who likes the motives of a certain action, and is still forced to discourage the action because of great difficulties in the way of its success. I was in a District of the United Provinces where an impecunious friend, whose sole asset in life is perhaps an extraordinary enthusiasm and a determination not to be overcome by difficulties of whatsover magnitude, had, without resources or support, founded, and carried on for many years, a High School for Mohamedan boys. The spirit of the enterprise demanded reverent praise; but the actual state of affairs discouraged enthusiasm. Close at hand was a Government High School with a substantial building which had a roof,—ours at the Islamia School had not,—and teachers whose salaries, tempting enough for Mamlatdars, were regularly paid every month,—a fact which was not true of our school. Friends and foes alike advised my friend to close the school, and put up in the place of its foundation stone an epitaph with the inscription, "Here lies learning done to death by her pristine friends, the descendants of the founders of the Universities in Cordova, Baghdad, and Cairo." Our counsels of prudence and pessimism, however, failed to convert our friend, who went on eking out the income of the school with his own savings out of the profession of—Journalism! But in the end, we too were converted to his views, for actual experience taught us what sentiment alone could not do. We learnt that it would be possible to create from the income of the school twenty handsome scholarships, which could be attached to the Government School, but those twenty handsome scholarships would not attract more than three or four Mosalman scholars, whereas the school attracted no less than a hundred. The difficulty is that we presuppose as a rule that Mosalman parents are enlightened enough to educate their children if only the wherewithal is supplied, whereas Mosalman parents have to be humoured and cajoled and attracted towards education by all sorts of means that human ingenuity can devise. We must deal with them as they are, not as they ought to be. Human affairs cannot be discussed from the hypothetical world of books, and those who imagine that it would be better to create

Scholarships and Chairs to be attached to Government Colleges and Schools for the benefit of the Mosalmans, would do well to profit by our experience. The mountain refuses to come to Mohamed. It is now for Mohamed to go to the mountain.

Apart from the advantages mentioned before, namely of drawing towards education those Mosalmans who would have remained illiterate but for Islamic colleges and schools, apart also from the advantages of producing an *espirit de corps* as necessary for all educational institutions as it is wanting in those of India, there is the great advantage of teaching a race, which had all its needs supplied so far by kings and ministers, the great lessons of self-help, and self-reliance. Sir Alfred Lyall, the former Lieutenant-Governor of the United Provinces, pointed out that the reason why the Government had constantly encouraged and supported the Aligarh College was, that it was the first in Upper India to represent and embody the principles of self-help and self-reliance in the matter of higher education. Even a casual observer of affairs cannot fail to see that we in India expect everything to be done by the Government. Ages of autocratic control have destroyed all initiative in the people, and next to a benevolent Providence, we have come to regard our King, "the Shadow of God," as the universal supplier of wants. It would spare us a good deal of disappointment, if we remembered that the King of to-day has no desire to be regarded, like the Sultans and Cæsars of old, as a sacrosanct personality with an omnipotence that can justify endless beggary from his subjects. The subjects are the descendants of Padishahs and Sultans, but the sovereign is a descendant of the Anglo-Saxon soldier-citizens, whose king was nothing more than the embodinent of their national identity. Used to the practical energy of the people in its island home, our Government is surprised to find in us only the unpractical energy of petitions and protests. We, accustomed to the kings of old, whose ideal was "everything for the people, nothing by them," are astonished at the indifference of a Government that gives but charily, at its weakness in confessing that it needs popular support, and at the injustice of burdens which we never bore before. Be it remembered to the credit of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan that, without absolving the Government of the smallest portion of its responsibility, he made his people recognise the difficulty of its situation, and preached from our

Holy Scriptures the text, that "God never alters the condition of people, unless they alter it themselves." There is a class of people in India who think that the Government does not wish the people to do anything for themselves, and at the time of the passing of the Universities Act the protests of this class were as strong as they were numerous. I have no concern with politics, and certainly no desire to confound it with education. But I wish to point out that the very first proposal of the Government after the passing of that Act, depends entirely upon the support of the people of India. I refer to proposed College at Ranchi, where a new experiment is to be tried in education. We of Aligarh have already tried that experiment, and to judge from the declared views of the Government, tried it too with success. We do not oppose our efforts to those of the Government, but only further its wishes in the matter of popular responsibility in education. And actuated by the best motives of loyal co-operation with the Government, and inspired by the desire to seek out our salvation ourselves, we have selected education as our ideal. Said Professor T. W. Arnold, the well-known Orientalist, on the eve of his departure to England, "And what a noble ideal this one is of a Mohamedan University! In what grander or more fruitful form can the Indian Mosalmans hope to arrive at the realisation of their national consciousness? Let some political project become the centre of their national life, and they run the risk of kindling a conflagration that blood alone may be able to quench. A purely religious or theological movement may draw out again those dark mists of fanaticism and bitterness that you are so anxious to leave to die away."

Though these considerations, namely the perpetuation of the memory of Sir Syed Ahmed, the completion of his life-work, the establishment of such institutions as would actually attract towards education men whom the present Universities do not, and the embodiment in an educational institution of the principles of self-help and self-reliance, are so important that nothing except most potent reasons can prevent us from endeavouring to found a Mohamedan University, I must own that they are only general considerations which may not succeed in converting those who scoff at the scheme we have proposed. But there exist particular considerations of our peculiar needs, and it is necessary to enter into

details, because we have been told that our scheme is floating and vague. Says Mr. Hydari, "After the most diligent search I have found it impossible to lay my hands on any definite statement as to the scope and functions of a Mohamedan University, on any arguments—apart from mere sentiment—by which such a University is sought to be recommended to our suffrage. Arguments can only be brought forward against arguments, criticism can only be usefully directed against concrete practical proposals; but here we have to address ourselves to nothing but a name without even a definition." This is a statement which, I fear, exposes Mr. Hydari to the charge of gross neglect and ignorance, if not of conscious suppression of truth. What the nature of his "most diligent search" was we do not know, but we know that a short letter to the Secretary of the Aligarh College Trustees will bring to any one who desires to read it, a mass of literature on the subject of this University, from the detailed scheme of the late Mr. Justice Mahmood in 1873, down to the 250 pages of printed extracts from the Lahore Educational Conference Report of 1899, and the most recent magazine and newspaper articles on that subject. The indictment of Mr. Hydari passes sweepingly over the schemes of Messrs. Beck and Morison, Justices Mahmood and Amir Ali, and Nawab Imad-ul-Mulk Bilgrami, besides the writings and utterances, among others, of the poet Hali and Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk. But that is not all. This statement is a libel against that great College which in the five-and-twenty years of its existence has achieved a success more "concrete," and "practical" than all the cloudland fancies and brain-spun gossamers of closet philosophers. Aligarh is itself a sufficient argument in its favour, though it is doubtful whether criticism can "usefully be directed" against its existence. The desire for a Mohamedan University is not for the construction of a fairy palace of impossible dimensions on an aerial foundation. It means only the expansion of Aligarh till it could legitimately ask the King-Emporor to permit it to fix its own course of studies, and give its own degrees. And this expansion of Aligarh is no chimæra. On the contrary, when one considers the many schemes of studies teeming with details, it is hard to suppress a smile at the recollection of our typical Oriental friend, the Shaikh Chilli of our nursery tales. Definiteness except in the delineation of the scope, the aims, and the general policy of the

University, would not be an advantage in the case of an idea which is essentially progressive. Even if these outlines were enveloped in a mist of dreams, it would be no great misfortune. As the late Mr. Beck, who was himself a dreamer of dreams, said, "It is necessary to dream of the distant future. We are planting a tree that will take centuries to arrive at full growth."

This much on the charge of vagueness, which can only have the support of ignoraunce if not indifference at its back. Such ignorance might have been left to find its own correction, were it not that in our present condition it is highly dangerous. All India is not in love with the Mosalmans and it is not natural that a former victor should find in his vanquished foes his best sympathisers when he is himself vanquished. To those who are hostile to our cause every dissenting voice from our own ranks is the voice of a prophet. To those who are but indifferent observers of our affairs, who have no direct knowledge of Aligarh, nor of our aspirations and hopes as a race, the criticism of a magazine article may appear to be the last word that could be said on so important and difficult a subject. It is this which forces me to repeat what has been said more than once by many others far more qualified to speak on this question than myself.

Let us ask ourselves, what are the functions of a University apart from the merely technical one of giving degrees and diplomas. If we agree with Mr. Hydari in confining those functions to "the provision of advanced instruction in all the branches of knowledge, accompanied, if possible, by the prosecution of orignal research in them," we shall be making a great mistake. Not that by itself this function cannot make an educational institution a University. But we at Aligarh have set before us the two Universities of Cambridge and Oxford as our models, and those who have a direct acquaintance with these typically English institutions will agree that Mr. Hydari's definition of a University's functions ignores one, and I believe the greater, half of what these English Universities provide for their members. The life outside the lecture-rooms, the life of the play-grounds, and the river, of the debating societies, the wine parties, and the tea-rooms, finds no place in Mr. Hydari's University. But that is just the life of Oxford and Cambridge. Hear what Mr. Andrew Lang, one of the most brilliant, and yet scholarly sons

of Oxford, has to say of her: "It has been less a home of learning, on the whole, than a microcosm of English intellectual life. A Oxford the men have been thinking what England was to think a few months later, and they have been thinking with the passion and energy of youth. The impulse to thought has not perhaps very often been given by any minds within the College walls; it has come from without, from Italy, from France, from London, from a country vicarage, perhaps from the voice of a wandering preacher. Whencesoever the leaven came, Oxford (being so small, and in a way so homogenous) always fermented readily, and promptly distributed the forces, religious or intellectual, throughout England."

The model which we have placed before us does not confine the functions of a University to mere learning, but includes in the term Education the formation of character also. We may, for the purposes of analysis, separate by a mental demarcation character and scholarship, or religious and secular education, but in reality education is synthetical, and it will be nothing short of laceration to separate one from the other. Only after a clear understanding of this is it possible to proceed further with the discussion. Confining the functions of a University to the provision of advanced instruction in all branches of knowledge, and then dividing the entire circle of human knowledge into two unequal segments, those of secular and theological learning, Mr. Hydari takes it for granted that there is no inherent necessity for a distinctly Mohomedan University as far as the larger of the two segments, *viz.*, secular learning is concerned. This novel assumption, which if granted makes further arguments unnecessary, is supported by a piece of sentiment, that secular learning "knows no race, no colour, no creed." Tested by a reference to history this assumption and the supporting sentiment fall to the ground. The treasure-house of the world's knowledge has been enriched by the offerings of many races, and numerous creeds, and the offerings of each are distinct in individualities, each bearing the unmistakeable stamp of the temperament, the constitution, and the life-history of the race or religion that has dug out the mines of knowledge The contributions of China, Egypt, and ancient India, of Greece and Rome, and to some extent, even of the modern nations of Europe, are distinct and cognizable. The ethnology of the races, and the religions that

have moulded the characters of men are a necessary part of the study of the *origines* of knowledge. Who then would be so bold or ignorant as to say that the Saracenic civilization, which has in Europe its own *savants* and acadamies, has not produced a learning as distinct from others as that of the land of the Pharoahs, or of the city-states of Greece and Rome ?

I would be far from suggesting that the Mussalmans should study nothing but what the world owes to their ancestors. It would be against the example of early Islamites, just as it would be against the spirit of Islam. The Prophet said that learning was our birthright, and we were to gather it from every possible source just as if we were collecting our long lost patrimony. The Mussalmans of Cordova and Baghdad, too, showed catholic tastes in their theft of knowledge. The extent to which they were originators, and the extent to which they were mere continuators of the researches of others, are controversial matters. But if one thing is more certain than another, it is this, that Mussalmans never considered any portion of human knowledge alien to them. If we undertook the study of the works of our ancestors that in itself would be sure to save us from narrowness, for they abound in expressions of obligation to non-Muslim and non-Arab sources. But there is no danger of any sane man suggesting a narrowing of the circle of knowledge to Saracenic learning alone. It would be blindness to ignore the progress which the world has made in Literature, Philosophy, and Science, since the time of the last of Muslim Doctors, and madness alone would approve of our failure to avail ourselves of the treasure-troves discovered by others.

But two things must be remembered. Firstly, whatever may be the etymology of the word University, it is not possible in these days of rich harvests of learning for any University to appropriate the whole cornucopia of knowledge. The economic principle of the division of labour has made itself felt in our Universities. Not that in the past there were no Universities which neglected some branch of Science or Literature. The University of Bologna, one of the most flourishing institutions of Christendom in the Middle Ages, was a University with the sole Faculty of Jurisprudence. Salerno, likewise, had only one Faculty, that of Medicine. In the English Universities of to-day the spirit of specialization is just as

apparent as it was before. While Birmingham has a University which provides what its supporters call "useful" knowledge, Oxford is still indifferent to the fascinations of the Philistine's ideal of utility. Again, while Cambridge provides special facilities for the students of Mathematics and Science, Oxford still lives in the past, and preserves the bones of Greece and Rome.

In the second place, it must be remembered that unless a nation is unhappy in the fact that it has no history, or it is so degenerate that it is indifferent to the greatness of its past, it is only natural that it should have a special interest in its life-history. The history of the Saracens, and of the ancient Aryans of India is a vast treasure which has not yet given itself up even to the patient researches of the Germans, and the brilliant intuitions of Frenchmen. We must therefore undertake the study of the literary activities of our Hindu, and Mussalman ancestors, if the Present is not to be thought entirely unworthy of the Past. The proper study of anything requires an affection for it as a condition precedent. Is it then probable that in the natural order of things a Max-Muller would have greater affection for the Vedanta than a direct descendant of the Vedantic philosophers, or that a Wiel or a Von Kremmer would admire the deeds of the Saracens more than a son of the race ? In the ordinary course of things, therefore, we should expect a classical work on the antiquity of the Vedas or on the period of the Ramayan from a Hindoo, and a history of the Caliphate as an institution, or a thesis on the historical value of the Traditions from a Mussalman. And yet our expectations, if we have any, are daily belied by the appearance of scholarly dissertations on, and critical editions of Hindu Sacred books, and Mussalman literatures above the names of foreigners, and from strange and foreign publishing firms.

What better remedy could be suggested for this strange and unusual state of things than the the foundation of Mohomedan and Hindu Universities, with the provision for advanced instruction in a secular learning that knows, in a way, both race and creed ? It is not possible, even if it be desirable, for a neutral Government to provide a course of instruction, say, in that portion of the history of Astronomy with which the Saracens are intimately connected. The importance of the subject is only historical, and Mussalmans alone

are likely to be interested in it. To any one who desires to glide down the main stream, these backwaters are neither attractive, nor ordinarily accessible. Yet they have, neglected as they generally are, a strange fascination for those who have a world of memories floating thereon. Dr. Ziauddin, a distinguished scholar of the Aligarh College, is now, after his completion of the advanced Mathematical course of Cambridge, studying the Mussalman connection with Astronomy, in Germany. It is hoped that he will lift the curtain of neglect after five centuries during which no European scholar found enough attraction in it to make a special study of the subject. Could such a study have been undertaken in any of the existing Universities of India? Nay, is there any chance of such studies ever being undertaken in Government Universities? The Musslmans are not the only subjects of His Majesty, and if the facilities which we require were provided for us, it would be an injustice if similar special facilities were not provided for the Hindoos, the Christians, the Parsees, and the Buddhists. In short, the kind of education which we desire to provide for the future generations of Mussalmans, and which we hope the Hindoos also will provide for their posterity, is exactly one of those things which a neutral Government can never give us. What it can do is to encourage popular enterprise in the matter, and to help it with all the resources such as money and expert advice which it has at its command.

If the Mussalmans were allowed to found a University of their own,—and there is no reason to suppose that they will not, considering that even Austria has given separate Islamic educational institutions to Bosnia and Herzegovenia, and in Germany, where the Reformation was preached with a violence greater perhaps than in any other country, there is a Catholic University aided by the State,—they could follow one of two courses. Following the example of Oxford, which builds up on the basis of ancient Greek and Latin languages, and the Art, History, and Philosophy of the Greeks and Romans, a superstructure of modern literatures, philosophies, and sciences, the Mussalmans could base their early studies on Saracen learning, and after acquiring a knowledge of Method in these researches, could apply their minds to the intellectual activities of their own times, with which they would naturally have great sympathy. Or, on the other hand, they could make the study of contemporary literatures and

sciences their basis, and allow those interested in what the world calls "obsolete" literatures, and "dead" philosophies, to take excursions into obscure and ancient realms of knowledge. Benares, too, would provide like Aligarh a characterstic course of studies for the Hindus, and there would thus grow up two great centres of literary activity, each with its own traditions, and memories, and dreams.

> Not like to like, but like in difference ;
> * * * *
> Self-reverent each, and reverencing each,
> Distinct in individualities,
> But like each other *ev'n as those who love*.

The great defect of our Universities, *viz*, the dispersion of learning, which is so wasteful in its results, cannot be remedied, unless our centres of learning possess some force of attraction greater than that of the insipid colleges of India. While now the establishment of an inferior college, no more than 20 miles nearer the homes of the scholars, can lure them away from a more distant, though far superior college, the establishment of centres of learning with the force of attraction such as the Aligarh and the Benares Universities will possess, will for the first time make it possible for a good professor to have a full class of students. While now professors of distant colleges remain entirely ignorant of the methods of teaching of each other, and are incapable of exchanging their views on the momentous questions concerning their profession, they would be able, in the large University towns such as we advocate, to benefit both themselves and their students, by a frequent exchange of ideas and methods. Aligarh would become a centre of learning as distinguished as its predecessors of Cordova and Baghdad, and preserve the learning of the Saracens in a way that neither Mecca nor Stamboul can hope to do.

There is yet another thing which such centres of learning alone could make possible. Great libraries are absolutely necessary for any literary research worth the name being undertaken. But few colleges in India have a library comparable even to the small library of an Oxford College, and not even all the collected libraries of all the Indian Universities would equal the treasures of the Bodleian. Is it not a matter of shame to the Mussalmans that India, full of the libraries of their kings, and noble men, and doctors of learning, is

so rapidly being denuded of Arabic and Persian manuscripts ? Not even the treasures of Patna and Rampur can now compete with the magnificient collections of Cambridge, and Oxford, of the India Office, and the British Museum. The wealth discovered is as yet nothing compared to the wealth undiscovered. The changing fortunes of great houses during, and after the Mutiny, and the subsequent ignorance, and indifference of descendants of patrons of learning, have consigned to many a strange neglected place the precious gems of old times. The collective effort of a whole community can still reclaim from the dust and the worm those rare works which the world would not willingly let die.

After all this, is it possible to believe with Mr. Hydari that "for secular learning the foundation of a Mohamedan University would be an act of supererogation," simply because one out of our five Universities in India prescribes Mr. Amir Ali's "History of the Saracens" as a text-book, and another offers degrees in Oriental learning which no sane person has recently been known to take ? If our present Universities and Colleges cannot provide for the intellectual needs of the Mohamedans,—and the same is true of the needs of the Hindus,– what other institution except a new University on the lines proposed can do it ? It could not be done by new Colleges alone because they would not be free to choose their own *curricula*, and shackled by the chains of dependence on Universities which are indifferent to their interests, and ignorant of their internal economy, those Colleges would be in the position of Aligarh, which cannot, if it would, clear out new paths of learning. Even now there is an Oriental Faculty in the Panjab University, but no one with any knowledge of its depreciated Oriental degrees, and the scanty provision for Oriental studies, will seriously recommend an extension of that system. The Canning College of Lucknow had an Oriental Faculty also, but its failure has nothing to tell us if it gives no forewarning for the future. Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, it need not be said, was himself a learned man in Oriental lore, and was most anxious to encourage it. But it was his own firm opposition to the creation of an Oriental Faculty in the Univiersity of Allahabad that spared us another failure. To him that Oriental learning was fraught with the greatest perils which was divorced from Western methods. If Aligarh desires a University which will

give an impetus to Oriental learning, it does not desire it on the lines of the extinct Oriental Faculty of Lucknow, and the extant Faculty of Lahore. It desires a combination of Eastern matter and Western manner, which could infuse into the dry bones of our Saracen learning the revivifying spirit of Western research and criticism. For the creation of such a combination the existing Universities of India have proved themselves to be utter failures, because the first condition of success, namely intense special interest, is in them lacking. The associations and traditions of Benares and Aligarh are far more powerful to concentrate interest, self-sacrifice, and devotion, and to magnetise from a distance a large multitude of people, than the insipid creations of a confessedly, and justly neutral Government. With learning dispersed, and social life scattered over a vast area, the existing Indian Universities can never hope to realise the Viceroy's dreams, or rather his recollections of Oxford.

And what does the Aligarh of the future promise? This is what the late Mr. Theodore Beck, its Principal, wrote of it to a correspondent: "Here the students would not only be under that reasonable discipline so necessary in youth, but the concourse of so many active and eager minds, interested in all sorts of subjects, would in itself be one of the most important factors in education. The Professors, Indian and English, would also live within the University precincts in constant intercourse with the students, and the University would thus form a little world of its own, the intense intellectual life of which it is difficult to explain to any who have not experienced such a life. Daily intercourse between the students themselves, common interest, common pursuits, studies, sports, conversation, meals, wakens a keenness of fellowship and of intellectual life that nothing else can do. In little such a life exists now in the M. A.-O. College, Aligarh, as many of its past and present students will testify. Our object is to extend, develop, and perfect this life. The concourse of a large body of professors and a great number of students would stimulate intellectual life, the ideas of the students would be widened, and their character strengthened. The men would be turned out more capable in every respect. The place would acquire powerful traditions, and the hundred influences to which the student would be subjected would place on his mind a permanent stamp. Learning would find a home. Great scholars

would arise, and reside in the University; and the place would be the most distinguished seat of Mohamedan learning in the world. Students would flock in from all quarters, and an enormous impetus would be given to Mohamedan education. I believe that such a University would accomplish nothing short of the regeneration of the Indian Mohamedans."

On the other hand, what is the character of the present education which we declare to be insufficient and even injurious? "Compare," wrote Mr. Beck, "the life and training in an institution such as this with the dull and lonely condition of an average Indian student at a Government College. Unless his home happens to be in the same city, he lives alone, in a probably uncomfortable lodging in the native bazar. He makes his way daily to the College to attend classes, and in these classes his intercourse with, and knowledge of his Professors, as a rule, begins and ends. He may very likely not even be known to them by name. No sports and games are organised for his leisure, no debating societies, or social clubs, no religious observance or help, no medical aid in sickness, no control or guidance in case he should be tempted to folly or vice. His one object is to cram his head with the necessary knowledge for his examination, and to get away again. All the more valuable parts of such a student's nature are left uncultivated and undeveloped, and in the true sense of the word he receives no education at all."

This is a comparison made by one who had lived the life of an English University, bright, intellectual, refined, and thrilling. He had had constant experience of the life of Indian students in Indian Colleges, and dissatisfied with the state of affairs, he had, under the guidance of Sir Syed Ahmad who supplied the Indian and the Islamic elements in the policy of the College, created an atmosphere at Aligarh which claimed far more justly a kinship with the bracing air of Oxford and Cambridge, than with the languor and depression of Calcutta or Bombay. To appreciate the justice of the comparison one must needs have lived the life of each of these institutions in turn; and if I may claim something for myself, I can claim, I hope justly, an intimate personal acquaintance with all the three institutions. I began my school career at a neutral college; broke the continuity of that insipid existence, of which the most exciting episodes were free

fights between the Hindus and the Mosalmans with the help of mercenary auxiliaries from the city *badmashes*, by joining Aligarh; and after eight years of varied pleasures, found myself, as if by a dream-like transition that causes no surprise, wearing the cap and gown of an Oxford Commoner, and breathing in the fuller and freer atmosphere of an English University town. Here, as at Aligarh, far the more important part of education was that which one receives outside lecture-rooms. For unlike our Indian Colleges, except Aligarh, Oxford and Cambridge are residential institutions, where common sports, common literary societies, a common table, and a common Chapel provide for the corporate existence of their members. In India, too, the Universities Commission admired the residential character of Aligarh, and recommended to the Government of India an adoption of that system. The weakest point of the India of to-day is not its ignorance or unintellectuality, but its want of character. Indian reformers of education as a rule insist on the provision of institutions for Research in Literatures, Philosophies, and Sciences; but none save Syed Ahmad put his finger on the sore spot by insisting on *character* rather than on *learning*. There is very little in the Aligarh of to-day to distinguish it from other Colleges except its residential life which is quite unique in India. For Syed Ahmad's ideal was a *gentleman* rather than a *scholar*.

And the Civilization which was to find its original fountain at Aligarh was Islamic and Oriental in its essence. He was not the man to cling irrationally to all that was ancient, nor was he the man to be charmed by the magnetism of all that is novel. He had the clearest possible ideas on the subject of "the Aligarh type," and those memorable words of his in which he spoke of the policy of the College can never be read or heard without a thrill of joy and admiration. Addressing a large audience he declared,

فلسفہ ہمارے داہن ہاتھہ میں ہوگا اور نیچرل سائنس ہمارے باہن ہاتھہ میں - اور کلمہ لا الہ الا اللہ کا تاج ہمارے سر پر

(Philosophy shall be in our right hand, and Natural Science in our left; And the crown of "There is no god but God" shall adorn our head.)

Mr. Beck, too, hoped that the University at Aligarh would, like the Universities of Christendom, preserve for Islam elements of its

past civilization, and culture. Speaking of the Universities of Europe, he said: "They have not only been the homes of modern thought and of intellectual discovery, but have revised and preserved the magnificent culture of Greece and Rome, which for centuries had lain buried. And so I conceive that our contemplated University should combine with its primary aim of conveying to the people of India, and more particularly the Mohamedans, the wealth of Western Science and Literature, the additional object of preserving the peculiar culture of Islam. Ever since the early Crusaders encountered in the Holy Land a society more refined and cultivated than their own, "the East," which in nine cases out of ten means the civilization of Islam, has exerted on the imagination of Europe an irresistible fascination. Our poets and our painters drew from the East innumerable themes. Islam in India has brought to perfection one of the highest forms of architecture; Delhi, Agra, Bijapur, and Ahmedabad bear witness to the inventive genius, and exquisite sense of beauty of the ancestors of the present Indian Musalmans. With such monuments before him, will anyone venture to say that there are no elements worth preserving in the civilization of Islam?" "I am," he added, "far from wishing to hide what I regard as the appalling evils of Oriental society, or my faith in the superiority of the 19th century civilization of Europe above that of any society existing anywhere previously in the world. But while admitting these evils to the full, while condemning everything that is bad in Indian life, and seeking to assimilate every element of good evolved by human progress, we should not neglect or destroy the good thing with the bad. We can afford to recognise that the ancient civilizations of India, both Hindu and Mohamedan, contained in them beauties or refinements which may be absent in an entirely modern one, such as that of America or Australia, and which a University should rightly preserve."

Nothing could be a more pathetic proof of our degeneracy than this, that here at Aligarh an Englishman, and there at Benares an Englishwoman, appeal to us Musalmans, and Hindus, the degenerate inheritors of great if decaying civilizations, to preserve the patrimony of *our* forefathers; and that while a Dutch University has a Professor of Mohamedan civilization, an educated Musalman of position and influence considers it superfluous, if not

actually injurious, to preserve that civilization by means of a University!

Japan at present occupies our thought and imagination to a wonderful degree; and while some welcome, what they call, "the re-birth of Asia," others dread the realization of the Yellow Peril. Let us hear what the Bishop of South Tokyo wrote to his ecclesiastical *confreres* in England. "I do not think," he wrote, "the probability of any such movement on a world-affecting scale likely in the near future; but if it *did* come, and Japan with China became a leading influence in the world's thought and government, it would be so because Japan, by taking out of its treasures things Eastern and Western, things new and old, had become the best leader for the next stage of human progress." One can see, if one reflects a little, that even this great People who in the advance of civilization "have covered 500 years by a forced march of 50," cannot forget their origins. And it is just because of this, because of the deposit of the New resting over the solid residuum of the Old, that Japan is already such a great power, and may one day rise to be the greatest power in the world.

In India, the future is still in the womb, in chaos, in the making, still unknown, still unformed. The Past is not yet entirely past, and the Present is not yet entirely present. We have still time to determine what the future shall be, though the future of a race or country cannot entirely be moulded by the resolutions of debating societies, and the paragraphs of newspapers. In the present unsettled state two large streams of thought can be seen running. The flooding of the East by the West has resulted in one view of life, which though rightly looking forward rather than backward for types of perfection, lacks that reverence for what has been, which is an essential element in the continuity and smoothness of progress. Crude unscientific ideas on the subject of evolution have produced in some of us a spirit of vanity which breaks out in the boast so often made that we are wiser than our sires. This spirit, while prevailing in some degree almost everywhere to-day, has produced in India a more ignoble and demoralizing sister spirit, not connected with time but with place, which makes us despise everything that is not Western. The arrogant feeling of superiority over our forefathers had at least the saving merit of producing

self-reliance. But the more cowardly sister spirit ruins all independence, and wrecks all sincerity, because we learn to play the sedulous ape, and flatter by abject obsequious imitation.

Not less objectionable, but even more so, is the other current of views, which makes us look back towards a legendary past for types of perfection. The farther *back* that we remove ourselves from the present, the more we *progress*. Such is the evident paradox which blind zeal fails to see. The ill-considered panegyrics of the present by some have produced its violent denunciation from others, and those who know the glowing imagination of the Orient, know also that white is never whiter, and black never blacker, than in India. Our worship of the past has, however, given to us a narrowness and obliquity of vision which is subversive of all progress. Some of us can discern nothing good in what is not Eastern or Indian, and even when reason forces on us the conclusion that modern European progress contains elements of greatness, we soothe ourselves by believing that they are really the ruins of the past, which later encrustations had hidden from our view until now.

With these two strong currents running in opposite directions, it is not an easy matter to make any progress ahead. But we must remember that our own determinations cannot destroy the forces of nature which are at work, moulding the characters and intellects of people in conformity with their environments. It would be as difficult to transplant bodily the civilization of England or America into India, as it would be to make our tropical vegetation thrive in the freezing winters of Europe. The Past again has a hold upon the Present from which it cannot tear itself away. No superstructure, no matter how grand and firm, can have one stone left upon another if we undermine its foundation. If the French politician of the Chamber of Deputies, separated from his brother M. P. of St. Stephen by a thin stripe of water, cannot exchange his flashing intuition and changing temper for the other's solid and slow common-sense and unchanging phlegm, we, who have the seven seas between us and Europe, and a past innocent of all direct contact with that continent for many centuries, cannot neutralise, by one heroic effort, the effects of climate, of geographical situation, and historical associations. It is impossible for us to become, in

thought and in deed, European of Europe. Our very wills are not ours, or rather, we and our wills are both under the magnetic influence of circumstances of time and place. But we are still free to assimilate whatever portion of modern European civilization our constitution will allow. Our Islamic tradition impels us to do the same. Said our prophet دع ما کدر خذ ما صفا (Take the good, leave out the evil). If we do that, we may some day realise the dream of the poet,

> And East and West without a breath
> Mixt their dim lights, like Life and Death
> To broaden into boundless day.

Now, what are the Origins of the Mosalmans which Nature will not allow them to forget? The Mosalmans are not a Race in the ethnological sense of the word. Nor is Islam confined to the narrow limits of what Geography calls a Country. And yet the Mosalmans, be they of Aryan stock or of Semitic origin, be they white, yellow, or black, have a distinct individuality of their own. Islam with its universal brotherhood threw Arab and Ajam Turk and Tartar, all into one melting pot, and out of it came an amalgam, a compound of many simples, distinct alike from other compounds and from the simples that composed it. To the outer world we were not Egyptains, or Persians, or Arabs, but Saracens. This distinct character the Mosalmans have retained in India in spite of the close contact, as friends and as foes, with its Aryan population. Not only that, but conversion gave to the Mohamedan Rajput a closer kinship with non-Aryan Mosalmans than with the other Rajputs who clung to the faith of their ancestors. What was, then, the essence of Mohamedan civilization? In a word, *it was Islam*. Just as Art was the basis of the Greek civilization, and Metaphysics that of the Hindu, Religion was the foundation on which the magnificent superstructure of the Saracen civilization was built. If the puritanic character of our faith had discouraged music, if its ideality had checked the growth of sculpture and painting, and if its righteousness had thrown into a more restricted channel the flow of Arab poetry of the Dark Times, with its free loves, and wars of vengeance, and even turned the Persian worshipper of Beauty into a Sufi with spiritual loves, our Religion had supplied us with a *practical* code of ethics for all aspects of human life, for all the

functions of father, son, husband, wife, friend, citizen, and conqueror. The principles of conduct were preached with a fulness of detail, and a wealth of illustration, which left them independent of the interpretation of glossators and commentators. Wheresoever our good sword carved for us a passage, we took with us the great Message of God, that promised salvation to all but the obstinate and the unruly. We did not fight for mere glory, though glory is lasting. We did not shed human blood for the sake of wealth, for that was vanity. We did not unsheath our sword for the advancement of trade, for we were not mercenary. But our sword was the key that unlocked the dark and dreary dungeons of the world, which the Koran flooded with divine light. First conquest, *then* preaching, for we trusted to the Koran to do the work of mercy which the soldier's sword could not do. The cheap sneers and false epigram of our opponents credit us with the offer of two alternatives, the Sword *or* the Koran. But we disarm all criticism by boldly announcing that ours was no disjunctive offer. Of the Koran, and the Sword, we gave both ; and gave both freely. Ours were no pigeon-livered preachers, but Warrior-Priests who lived up to their faith and died for it. It was not their zeal in war, but also their righteousness and charity, and the peace of their inner lives, which gave to our soldier-missionaries hosts of converts, whom greed had not allured, and cowardice not persuaded. Says Mr. Oman, speaking of the success of Christian Missions in the early Middle Ages, " The Saracen alone it was impossible to convert." But who was this Saracen ? Scratch him, and dig your nails deep enough, before you can find him to be a converted Jew, or Christian, or Copt, or Hindu. So it was not the fear of the overhanging Sword of Damocles, but the persuasiveness of the Truth that gave us converts.

I fear I have transgressed from my subject a little, but I wish to impress upon you clearly the fact that nothing has exercised on our civilization a more potent influence than our religion, and to leave Islam from the programme of Moslem regeneration would be like acting the play of Hamlet with the part of the Prince of Denmark left out. My friend Mr. Paranjpye, whose great patriotism as well as whose great attainments do not need my panegyrics, has only recently called Voltaire to his aid to prove the uselessness of Religion. He would trust to the *vis naturæ medicatrix* and the philosophy of

laissez faire for salvation; and brings Europe into the witness-box to confess that its tendency is towards irreligion. He is actuated by the best motives of political unity, but like a good Oriental in whose veins Religion flows with his blood, he asks Religion to give us the unity which we need; and when Religion proves a bad servant of politics, he declares "that the power of Religion is too exhausted to work out the salvation of our people." We know of a similar case when an Irish jury found a man guilty of murder because he had stolen the foreman's brown mare two years ago. A Mohamedan audience need not be told that their religion was not meant to be a handmaid of politics, nor that it did not identify itself with the narrower forms of patriotism, restricted within the outlines of geographical limits and ethnical distinctions. And we have the authority of deeper philosophers than that master of irony, Voltaire, to prove that as long as human nature suffers no radical change, so long shall Religion affect men as no other force has so far affected them. To say that the power of Religion has exhausted itself, means no less than that *God has ceased to exist!* We that have never adored fetishes, nor allowed reverence and affection for men to rise to the dignity of divine worship, we who believe in a God that has always existed and will always exist, cannot think that the force of our Religion is already spent.

But let us avoid all juggling and platform tricks about Religion. The problem of religious education is not a question which can be settled by the rhetoric of orators any more than it can be decided by the nimble activity of touch-and-go philosophers. Let us deal with it as a snake-catcher deals with a cobra, or a gardener with an undergrowth of nettles. No gingerly touch, but a quick grasp, determined and firm. In the world's history our name is recorded on account of the faith which inspired us in war as it moved us in peace. We owe our glory to that, but our degradation we owe to ourselves. Only when our wars, and politics, and domestic life were divorced from our faith did we decline, and now that the cup of our misery is full to the brim, it is because our religion has little or no real hold upon our lives and actions. There are the ritualists who pretend piety, and there are the spiritualists who dissemble sincerity. The stickler for ceremonial is laughed at, and laughed at justly. But, I submit,

that the spiritual Pharisee, who talks philosophy, and ethics, and culture, is the wretch who has not yet had his deserts. The best thing we can do is to neutralise the subtle influence of his honeyed phrases and of the facile faiths that he preaches, by providing for our posterity an educational institution where ritual and dogma, thought and act, should form an *ensemble* according to the true spirit of Islam.

Can this be done by a general religious education so often talked of and recommended? My reply is a determined "No." Religious development for large masses is not possible unless men are educated in some particular faith, the faith they believe in above all others. I do not say this of men "not versed in schools, but strong in sense, and wise without the rules." Exceptions cannot but add force to the general principle. Let us take an instance. The Mission Colleges impart instruction in Christian Scriptures to non-Christians also, but the effect of that moral training on Christian and non-Christian students is so unlike. The fact is, that the intensity of belief which makes religion a living force in our lives is possible only when we muster under the banner of some one faith or other, and consider that banner and that faith peculiarly ours. Education on more latitudinarian lines has so far failed to teach men anything more than hazy generalities about the supernatural which will not satisfy the yearnings of the finite for the infinite, and vague general principles which will not supply the need of a stringent well-defined code of morals ready for use in all emergencies. And where can this moral instruction in Islamic Ethics, the most practical as Napoleon said, and the most simple as Gordon declared, can be given, if not in a Mohamedan University?

The Government of India has taken up the management of education not from any very great love for the task. It took it up when it knew that no one else would do so, and therefore chose the lesser evil of state-management rather than the greater evil of having no management at all. And even now, in spite of its having declared itself a better manager of education than the writers of newspaper paragraphs, and the winners of law-suits, it has great misgivings of final success. In the place of the ignorance of the religious, it is confronted by the no less formidable menace, though only a spiritual one, the irreligion of

the learned. Some years ago Sir James La Touche, after reading before a meeting of the Aligarh College Trustees the encouraging letter of Lord Elgin after the death of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, said, "Government may aid by direct money grants, but there are many things connected with the management of an institution such as this which the State cannot do properly, or ought not to try to do, and which can only be effectively accomplished by the enlightened co-operation of its subjects, men who accept the educational policy of the Government, and appreciate European culture and learning." And in the recent proposal of another Lieutenant-Governor, the proposed College at Ranchi, the Government desires to encourage religious education, but instead of providing for it itself, conforms to its old policy of expedient neutrality, which neither Mr. Gladstone nor Bishop Weldon could oppose with success, appeals to the believers in different faiths to provide for it themselves. The creation of a Mohamedan University would, therefore, not only satisfy one of the foremost needs of Mosalmans, but relieve the Government of a great burden which it can neither lift up with expediency, nor throw away in despair.

But would it be possible in practice to teach Hanifi, and Shafii, Maliki, and Hambali, Isna Ashari, and Ismaili, theologies side by side, without giving rise to petty quarrels every day ? Much is made of this hypothetical evil by Mr. Hydari, and even so well-informed a paper as the *Bombay Gazette*, with its recent experience of Moharram riots between Sunnis and Borahs at Bombay, fell into the trap. Let us answer this objection in detail. Even if we confine religious instructions, as Mr. Hydari seems to do, to education in theology, we must remember that the only great division among Mosalmans is that which separates Shiahs and Sunnis. But they differ radically not in a religious matter, but a political one, viz., the succession to the Caliphate of Islam. Those who wish to make capital out of this political difference will have a grim satisfaction in reflecting that that Caliphate has long ago ceased to exist. Not that idle dogs will not fight even now over the shadow, or even the smell of a bone now removed. But what real force such difference still possesses for enlightened Mosalmans can be seen best at Aligarh, where theological instruction is imparted to Shiahs, and Sunnis, Hanafis, and Mo'tazalis alike. In a quarter of a century not even a

whisper of sectarian jealousy has been heard at Aligarh; and there alone in the whole world, except that abode of universal brotherhood, the house of God which Abraham built, Shiahs and Sunnis are seen praying side by side in the same mosque, adoring a common God, and asking for blessings on a common Prophet. To the alarmists of the arm-chair school of philosophy, Hali gives the best answer.

کبھي یہاں آ کے کچھہ دیکھا بھي هي اے نکتہ چین یارو
برا کہنا گھروں میں بیٹھکر اچھا ہیں یارو

But, though it is necessary to teach theology by means of text-books, and enforce on every Mosalman the passing of an examination in theology,—and let us hope that the spirit of Aligarh would one day make it possible for Shiahs and Sunnis to learn theology out of one comprehensive text-book containing the various opinions of Shiah and Sunni doctors, just as Sunni theology is taught to-day out of one book to all the sub-sects of the Sunnis,—we must remember that the teaching of theology is not the only, nor the most important part of religious education. At Oxford too they require all Christians to pass an examination in Divinity, which requires a knowledge of the Bible in Greek, and of the history of the Christian faith. But they depend upon the Chapel, and still more upon the moral influence of Christian Deans and Masters, generally ordained clergymen, for giving to the life of undergraduates the leaven of Christianity. In our University, too, there would be a careful study of the Koran which would combine reverence with free enquiry; and there would be a study of those most critical of all commentaries, the Life and the Traditions of the Prophet, and the accounts of the lives of early Caliphs and Saints. There would also be prayers, and sermons, and lectures, all imbuing the lives of the undergraduates with the spirit of their faith. But as Islam is essentially a practical faith, for the work-a-day world, and not for metaphysicians, nor for Sundays and Sabbaths only, and as "things seen are mightier than things heard," we shall trust to the lives of our religious supervisors, and the persuasiveness of their acts rather than words, for the moral development of our young men on Islamic lines. And whatsoever differences there may be between Shiahs and Sunnis on matters political or ritual, there is no difference

between the ideals of a good Shiah's and a good Sunni's life. Those who doubt it may live at Aligarh for years, and confess at the end of their residence whether from the behaviour of any student they could discover if he was a Shiah or a Sunni.

اگر باور نہوا خلاص سني اور شيعہ کا

بہم شير و شکر يان چار بار و پنجتن ديکھين

Those who think like Mr. Hydari that "all this agitation for a Mohamedan University is meant only for the power of conferring degrees in Islamic theology," err like most Indian educationists of to-day, who think that there is no evil which a text-book and an examination cannot cure. Because theology forms but a minor matter for consideration in our programme, we can afford to ignore the suggestion that instead of creating a Mohamedan University, we should create special chairs for Islamic theology for Government Colleges, or attach Maulvis to teach theology in existing Government Schools. Even if that was all that was needed, the success which after a long and laborious campaign against Government neutrality in religion has crowned the efforts of our Nawab Vikar-ul-Mulk, is far from flattering us into the hope, that without a Mohamedan centre of patriotism, Mosalmans would be devoted enough to their faith to take advantage of the Government's decision to make religious education permissive in its schools. But it is the training of young men in Islamic character, rather than an instruction in text-books of Islamic theology, that we desire. For this the only means is the adoption of the residential system.

Here, however, two courses are open to us, besides the creation of separate Universities or Colleges for Hindus and Mosalmans. We may either have mixed hostels, and "adapt the growing boy," in the words of Mr. Hydari, to the environments of "a seething mass of heterogenous people, working and thinking apart from each other;" or, we may have, again in the words of Mr. Hydari, separate "well organised residential hostels under Islamic supervision, attached to existing institutions, and thus convert them into so many Aligarh Colleges dotted over the land." It is clear that these are two separate alternatives, and we must choose either of them, even though Mr. Hydari unaccountably seems to regard them as one proposal.

Let us first consider the question of mixed hostels. Our consideration of them is facilitated by the fact that every Government College in India has already some sort of a hostel attached to it, and therefore the virtues and defects of this system would not be only conjectural, but verifiable by actual experience. Had this not been the case, we might have been tempted to believe Mr. Hydari's glowing account of "friendships engendered in the ardour of youth in the common class-room, between those that shall be the leaders of their respective communities, when they are drinking together from the fountains of a glorious literature." Happy indeed is the man who has had such an experience, and I have no doubt some instances of schoolboy friendships can be found in every town of India, where young men of different persuasions and races are brought together by a common school. But in the dreary desert of bigotry and racial animosity, engendered by ignorance that masquerades as knowledge, and made fierce by "the ardour of youth," of those that will one day be the leaders of their respective communities in a bitter and narrow-visioned political warfare, who turn a glorious language, and a still more glorious literature to the uses, not of a broad-minded toleration or a tender-hearted peace, but of shallow sarcasm and shrieking vituperation, how like a fresh and green oasis, this schoolboy friendship of a Mosalman and a Hindu, who have escaped the contagion of school debating societies, and later political platforms, and are still capable of enjoying a quiet half-hour of domesticity, untroubled by Congresses, and oblivious of Corporations. Their life is a drop of fresh water which the heaven sends down to be lost in the brine of the ocean. Nor is their school-life a true sample of the school-life of their companions. In their mixed hostels there is neither religious instruction, nor a moral drill. Social life is reduced to the clustering together of sects and sub-sects that are at heart apart and aloof from each other. Their juxtaposition is not unity, nor is the contiguity of their lives an outward symbol of the identity of their hopes and aspirations. In fact these juxtapositions are like the meeting of two bulls, fierce and furious, dangerous to mind and morals, if not to the life and limb of the participants. They read text-books on history whose compilers are not historians, but politicians, and bad politicians at that. The result is certain, even if not the desired one. The students

find their caste and creed distinction and differences accentuated rather than obliterated, and before they have climbed to the higher regions of Literature, where peace reigns supreme, and toleration is perfect, they have opportunities of meeting men of other creeds and races, whom their little learning has taught them to hate rather than love and respect. Never was there so much bigotry in India as there is to-day, and what is so ridiculous, this is an age, not of intense religious beliefs, but of doubts, and mocking, and irreligion. It is not *good* Mosalmans and *good* Hindus that fight, but indifferent Mosalmans and irreligious Hindus. And while it must be confessed that there is a noble minority of educated Indians, whose toleration, due to a large extent to Western education, has never been surpassed, the greater portion of bigotry agitates not the bosoms of the ignorant and the illiterate, but excites to fury and to madness "the little-learned" of the land.

Even if by some chance peace is maintained in these mixed hostels, —which has not been my experience of more than one College,—it is not possible to overcome what are mis-called "minor difficulties." "A residential system worthy of the name," wrote Mr. Morison as his comment on this recommendation of the Universites' Commission, "implies constant interference with very intimate details of life, and a regulation of daily habits; the officer at the head of a residential School or College is truly *in loco parentis*, and in that capacity he must decide questions relating to dress, food, baths, conversation, religious exercises, and health of his students. Now, I do not think that the people of India are at present prepared to hand over the control of these very private concerns to mixed bodies, like the present University Syndicates." Those who think that they can do so, forget the differences not only of Hindus and Musalmans, but, among the Hindus themselves, of the Orthodox and the Reform parties, and of that "happy mean," the party which advocates only night-attacks upon Orthodoxy. The Colleges of Oxford before the 16th century lacked much of their present social life, and with a view to reform the English Church from within, by means of substituting a closer intimacy between the churchmen in the place of their monastic aloofness, Cardinal Wolsey founded the Christ Church College at Oxford on the new lines. He began by providing for the increase of social life, first and foremost, a large Dining Hall, and a

magnificent kitchen, the biggest in Oxford even to-day, just as the Christ Church Cathedral is the biggest among Oxford churches and chapels. The wits of the day were heard to say that the Cardinal began by founding a College, but ended by founding a kitchen! Now, in Indian Colleges a mixed Chapel is clearly impossible. But is there greater possibility of a mixed kitchen? I do not make the dining table the centre of gravity, but I must say that all over the world, when people celebrate common joys, and grieve over common griefs, a common table forms a strong element of unity. Therefore, it is not wise to ignore the practical difficulties in the way of a growing boy adapting himself to the environments of people, who not only think and act apart, but eat apart also!

There is, however, the other alternative, that of separate hostels, each under the control of those who are of the same faith as the resident undergraduates. This is the experiment that Sir Andrew Fraser, who is an admirer of the residential system as at work at Aligarh, but who is opposed to what he calls the sectarian character of that institution, is about to try at Ranchi. He will have boys "trained to live at school as they will have to live in the world afterwards; to have their contests and their friendships with boys of different classes and different home associations from their own." He desires that while such education should broaden the sympathies of the scholars, it should not impair their respect for religion, nor their *esprit de corps*. And with this end in view, he proposes to found at Ranchi a College where all religions and races should mix during College hours and in sports, but keep aloof in separate boarding-houses during the rest of the day.

Now, it is not a pleasant thing to declare a scheme, planned and proposed with the best of motives, doomed to failure, before it is even carried into execution. One is tempted to ask, why Sir Andrew Fraser, whose motive is unity, should still think it necessary for each Province to have its own centre of education, when every day the cry is "Empire," "Empire." One is also tempted to ask, why those who descried the most ignoble of motives in the administrative proposal of the Government of India to separate Eastern and Western Bengal, are now quietly acquiescing in a proposal which is based on the conjectural existence of a wide, unbridgeable gulf, that separates the Province of the Upper Ganges from

the Province of the Lower Ganges. But after all, inconsistency is no very great vice in bureaucrats, and is a *sine qua non* of political demagogues all over the world.

But to turn to the main question, let us understand the practical difficulties of separate hostels and mixed colleges before we give them our final approval. It is needless to point out that the lines of cleavage drawn by Political Geography are much less distinct than the lines of cleavage drawn by Religion in India. Unless some new force, *other than the misleading unity of opposition*, unites this vast continent of India, it will either remain a geographical misnomer, or, what I think it will ultimately do, become a Federation of Religions. And this conjecture of mine is to some extent verified by the scheme of Sir Andrew itself, which unites all races and religions in one College, unfortunately only a Provincial one, but separates them into so many 'houses' or 'hostels' according to the religion of each. The question is, will this College at Ranchi have all the success of the Aligarh system, without the supposed shortcomings of that so-called sectarian institution? Aligarh has always kept its doors open for all sects and creeds to enter. It has not, however, found itself competent to interfere with the internal economy of its Hindu scholars in the same way as it does with that of the Musalmans. In this decision Aligarh has been extremely wise, for it did not find that its experience of even Musalman parents and their prejudices was altogether of a pleasant character. Luckily Aligarh was never put to the test of solving the Hindu Question, for even though about a fifth of the students have been Hindus, they have generally been day-scholars. But if it had to deal with a larger number of Hindu resident students, it would have failed in one of two ways. If its English Professors and Mohamedan Founder and Trustees, had decided to interfere with the domestic life of its Hindu scholars, there would have arisen a host of undreamt of jealousies and prejudices. Had it, on the other hand, decided to pursue a *laissez faire* policy with regard to the Hindus, one half of the College would have been as unlike the other, as the Aligarh of to-day is unlike any other institution in India. It was the homogeneity of views among the Trustees, due to the masterful character of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, and the good understanding that prevailed all through his life between the

Trustees and the English staff of the College, due to nothing except a rare good fortune which favoured Sir Syed Ahmad Khan in the selection of his tutors, that saved Aligarh from the humiliation of a signal failure. But what is there peculiar in a Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal who is, as we know, a changing figure, that can give him the Dictatorship of Syed Ahmad ? Will the people of Bengal, whose opposition to officialdom is notorious, acquisce in any such arrangement ? What guarantee is there of a homogeneity of views among people of all races and creeds and political beliefs, and of a *modus vivendi* between English Professors who will form the official element, and the Indian supervisors of 'hostels' who would represent the various races and creeds of India ? Who will mark the lines of policy, the changing Governor of Bengal, the permanent English staff of Professors, or the many managers of separate 'houses' ? What will be the limits of official interference in the management of the separate hostels ; or would there be no official interference at all ? If not, who will guarantee a continuity of educational policy in the more important part of the College, viz., the residential 'houses' ? These are questions which should have arrested the attention of the administrator of a large Province, and which should have been answered at the time when the proposal was first published. But they have not been answered, and it is not known whether they have even been considered.

If the general policy of all the 'houses' or 'hostels' is to be the same, will it always recommend itself to the parents, who must after all be the final authorities in the matter of the domestic life of their children ? Remember, that Sir Syed Ahmad's College has only now, after the death of its great founder, succeeded in eliciting unanimous praise from the orthodox and the heterodox, after many years of suspicion, criticism, and obloquy. Syed Ahmad alone could hear with calm dignity the shrill voices of his shrieking fanatical opponents, and yet they came only from one race, one creed. Can a mixed body of people, Hindus, Mosalmans, Sikhs, and Christians bear with patience the ungenerous, the unworthy, the most debased opposition of the worse elements of all these creeds combined ? Not only that, but will the Government be able, or willing, to let its Public Prosecutor ignore the things written and spoken against its practice and its motives in connection with these hostels, when

we know that its Public Prosecutor smells gun-powder in every newspaper paragraph that ventilates folly or madness ? Syed Ahmad Khan, as the whole world knows, had not the pleasant experience of one who has all along "fed on roses, and lain in the lilies of life." Unless Sir Andrew Fraser can find a body of people who will neither quarrel among themselves, nor swear at him and his Government, nor demand a tooth for a tooth and an eye for an eye from every critic, and unless the Government itself can bear all the strain which fell on Syed Ahmad Khan, let us not delude overselves with vain hopes of fairy-tale successes.

If, on the other hand, each hostel is to have its own policy, what then is the advantage which separate hostels for a mixed College possess over a separate residential College, such as Aligarh ? "The hostel," said Sir Andrew Fraser, "is to provide home life, and the College is to provide secular instruction . . . . . The Hindus and Mosalmans would live their home life in these houses or hostels, but they would live, or learn to live the life of the world in their College." Translated into the language of practical life, it means that these hostels would be the hot-beds of narrow jealousies and sectarian prejudices, and the College would provide for our maddened bulls, as the existing Colleges do to some extent now, a large enough arena for showing the fierceness and the fury of their encounters. The time to call Aligarh sectarian and narrow would be *after*, not *before* the Ranchi College has succeeded. It may be said that our criticism of this scheme should also come after, not before, the scheme has failed. But remember, failure does not only check advance. It means a rapid march backwards. We in India have had enough failures in our National Congresses, and Municipal Elections. We ought to be, for mercy's sake, spared another failure and another retreat.

The mixed Colleges and mixed boarding-houses have already been tried, and found more harmful to the cause of unity than advantageous. The mixed Colleges and separate hostels are yet untried, and as we have seen, the dangers that we apprehend from them are no less. What disadvantage, then, there would be in a Mohamedan University at Aligarh, and a Hindu University at Benares, I fail to see. If a Mohamedan University only means a larger Aligarh, not even the most fastidious could desire anything

better. Sir Andrew Fraser has mistakenly believed that Aligarh shuts its door to Hindus, and that it is a College where Mosalmans alone can live. If the number of Hindu students that have studied there can disprove it, nothing can be a more eloquent testimony. Here is a table that illustrates the tolerance of Aligarh in figures that need no rhetoric to make them splendid.

Name of Examination.	Date from which Aligarh students appeared in it.	No. of Hindus.	No. of Musulmans.	Total.	Per centage.
Entrance or Matriculation	1877	101	331	432	23·3
F. A. or Intermediate ..	1880	89	330	419	21·2
B A.	1882	40	249	289	13·8
M. A.	1889	2	13	15	13·3
LL. B.	1892	11	26	37	29·7
D. Sc.	1901	1	1	2	50·0
Total ..	...	244	950	1,194	20·4

Government Colleges are, of course, not sectarian for they are open to all to join. Why is Aligrah sectarian, then, when it too freely educates men of all races and religions? And then, how many Government Colleges are there which have had twenty per cent. of their students of the Musalman race? The College at Ahmedabad has perhaps one or two Musalmans. The Colleges at Bombay and Poona have not many more. What chance is there of engendering those friendships in the ardour of youth of which Mr. Hydari seems to be enamoured? Aligarh alone has sent out into the world more than fifty Hindu graduates. Has the whole University of Bombay done that for the Musalmans? For all practical purposes the neutral Colleges are far more sectarian than Aligarh because they do not attract half the number of Musalmans that Aligarh attracts of the Hindus. But will this entitle any one to call them sectarian Colleges? If numbers are not relevant in this matter, let us turn to the spirit of Aligarh. If it can be proved that that spirit is even more tolerant than that of Oxford, little remains to be said thereafter. But it is a fact that Keble, and Hertford, and Magdalene will not have a non-Christian student within their walls, while the first two are confined to undergraduates who belong to the Church of

England. And here at Aligarh we gladly receive men of all the Churches of the whole world, and treat them with a tolerance that surprises those to whom the word Islam appeared to be synonymous with bigotry. Said Sir John Strachey, than whom no Englishman knew Aligarh better, "It (Aligarh) was primarily intended to educate good citizens and loyal subjects who would also be good Mohamedans, but its gates are freely open to those of other creeds, and its teaching cannot be charged with the intolerance which is often made a reproach to the men of your religion." A few days earlier the Marquis of Dufferin had spoken of us in these terms. "You have, however, decided, and in my opinion very rightly, to open your College to all irrespective of their creed, and it is I think much to the credit of the managing body of this institution that it is conducted on non-sectarian principles, that the Hindu scholar is as readily received as the Mohamedan, just as a native of Madras is as eligible as a native of these provinces." Six years earlier Sir William Hunter, LL. D., the President of the Education Commission, had said: "At the same time the Mohamedan founders of this strictly Mohamedan institution have thrown open their door to the youth of all races and creeds. Among the 259 students I find 57 Hindus, or nearly a fourth of the whole. Christian and Parsi lads have also received a liberal education within its walls. *This liberality of mind pervades not only its rules, and its teaching, but the whole life of the place.*" And this is the opinion of a statesman and a historian who was none too anxious to credit Islam with toleration or loyalty! Only recently an Address was presented to that true Citizen of India, Maharaja Sayaji Rao Gaekwar, by the members of the Aligarh College "Duty Society" deputation. They had not to convince

be founded, had failed to grasp the inner meaning of the spirit of the coming times, and the possibilities of education; they also expressed their surprise at finding educated Indians accusing them of bigotry when only on the day previous they had to combat against the uneducated Mosalmans of Baroda who accused them of irreligion, which really meant toleration. His Highness's reply sent a thrill of joy into the hearts of the young men, who had travelled long distances, burdened with the anxiety that the outer world was still suspicious of the liberal character of their College. He said: "The prosperity of India lies in the advance of all its races in a line, and there is no royal road to prosperity and progress, except education, *especially the education that you receive at Aligarh.*"

Leaving all these opinions aside, what could be a greater proof of the tolerant character of Aligarh than this, that it is from Aligarh that toleration has been preached to the Mosalmans of to-day, just as the stigma of intolerance has been removed from the names of the Islamic preachers of old. There is, moreover, not one political question in India which does not get involved in an entangling web of religion, and yet not one "Aligarh boy" has been known to have appealed to the instincts of bigotry and intolerance that still sway the ignorant and uneducated masses of India. I well remember that when I joined the Aligarh College in 1890, *Ramleela* and *Moharram* fell together for some years, and like other towns in India, Aligarh was a seething mass of bigotry and unreasoned prejudices. Riots took place, and many a brutal deed, many a deed of shame, was perpetrated by those that participated in them. But the students were not allowed to visit the town even to see the *tazias* or hear the *mersias*; and though it was hard to suppress the desire of the Irishman "to see if there was a row," it was not "'cos if there was, I would like to join!"

If this is the tone of the Aligarh of the past, and of the Aligarh of the present, why need we have fears of the Aligarh of the future, when it would be larger, and we hope, still freer? Few nations have fought more bitterly on religious questions than the Irish and the English, yet not even the most bigoted opponent of the Irish Home Rule would look with suspicion on such a non-political movement as the recent Irish Revival of Letters. It is, then, hard to see why a narrow politics should vitiate an academic institution

such sa a Mohamedan or a Hindu University. If we separate the two aspects of the University, the secular and the religious, we can easily grasp the situation. Looking at the first aspect, there is no reason why the students of *Mutanabbi* and *Hafiz* should quarrel oftener, and in a worse spirit, with the admirers of *Kalidas* and *Bhavabhuti*, than do the Oxford scholar of *Litera Humaniores* and the would-be Wrangler of Cambridge. Looking at the other aspect of the University, I have more faith in the liberalizing tendencies of modern education than to believe that we would always be fighting about cows and goats, or breaking each other's heads, or at least our own, over the question whether Urdu was brought from Arabia, or Hindi was imported from the arctic home of the Aryans. "The fountain-head," says Mr. John Morley, "from which every worthy enterprise issues forth, is a pious and just honouring of ourselves; *it is the sanctity and freedom of the man's own soul.*" This, he says, is the very basis of toleration; and inasmuch as higher education is the creation and augmentation of self-esteem, and of the sanctity and freedom of the man's own soul, there is every hope that such an education would teach us, both Hindus and Musalmans, the lessons of toleration and respect, rather than of intolerance and hatred. Says the Koran لكم دينكم ولي دين, and that is just the motto of Aligarh in its religious aspect. "To you your faith, to me mine."

Mr. Hydari has sought to prove from history, that "it is this tendency to sectarianism and isolation, that is one of the most deadly dragons that every Indian has to learn to slay, and so many-headed is it that many a time, and in many a place, and in many a guise, it must be killed, before it can be finally destroyed." One need not be as "scientific" a student of history, as Mr. Hydari thinks himself in a special degree to be, in order to see that civil wars have incessantly been waged in India from the first dawn of history, to the last chapter of the most recent record of modern times. He who runs may read it. But it is only the shallow student who would say that India has had more religious warfare than any other country of Asia, or Europe. If Europe waged three Crusades against the Mosalmans, it waged double that number against Christians themselves; and to every man slain in India by a Mohamedan or a Hindu bigot, there were scores of "heretics" whom a narrow Orthodoxy burnt at the

stake, or killed with untold tortures on the rack. So long as men hold different opinions on questions that touch their lives at some vital point, and so long as they have not the patience to argue and persuade, nor the charity to tolerate fidelity towards beliefs other than their own, so long war, with all its horrors, will remain the sole arbitrator of disputes, be they of Religion, of Politics, or of Trade. India has not been the sole sinner, nor even the greatest sinner, in this respect. Much as I abhor the logic of the stronger arm and the more piercing steel in matters of conscience, I confess, I would find it exhilarating to chance upon some yet undiscovered chapter of Indian history, which could tell of a large multitude of people moved by some stirring faith, no matter if it was barbarous, and brutal, and licentious, against some other people whom they fought with and crushed, even if the weaker faith was far the more spiritual, and far the more righteous. There is something exhilarating, something ennobling, in the spectacle of a surging mass of humanity, moved towards some one purpose, which unites them all, and makes them sink their petty differences, even if that purpose is unhallowed, because bigoted. But there is an unspeakable sordidness and meanness in the combination, in an outward form, and for a time only, of men moved by conflicting desires, identical only in their selfishness. And it is here, in selfishness, in pettiness, in meanness, that India has sinned, and sinned without repentance, and without remorse. Not one of its many wars but was either dynastic, or purely personal; and scarcely a battlefield is there, which has not had its traitor that seceded just when his help was most needed. The history of India is a story of broken vows, and impossible coalitions, of facile faiths, and calculating loyalties; and the student, wearied by its tiresome interminable personalities, and failing to discover some one large principle that could infuse life into its disjointed chapters, closes the book in despair of even finding my undiscovered chapter of exhilarating bigotry. It is therefore not so much bigotry as selfishness, that is the dragon which every Indian must learn to slay, and in the words of Mr. Hydari, "so many-headed is it that many a time, and in many a place, and in many a guise, must it be killed before it can be finally destroyed." And we in Aligarh, the descendants of those who have lost all that they possessed in the world, through the depredations of this embodiment of selfishness, have reason to be on our guard

against this many-headed monster of many disguises. Our Poet has not said in vain,

کسوٹي ہے يہہ دارالعلام اسلامي اخوت کي
ہم اوس سے بدگمان ہونگے جو اس سے بدگمان ہوگا

It is said that "the vastness of the area over which we are diffused will prevent all but an extremely small portion of those living at any distance from the Aligarh University from joining it, and thereby make it representative of, and the nucleus of the strength of only the Musalmans in its immediate neighbourhood, and not of the entire Mohamedan community." What narrowness of thought is displayed herein can be understood only by those who have some knowledge of the vast distances which our ancestors taversed to reach Cordova, Baghdad, and Cairo, where people did not measure the utility of learning according to the proportion of distances that they travelled to obtain it. Just as all roads led, at one time, to Baghdad, Rome, and Cordova, and not so very long ago to Delhi, Agra, and Lucknow, so, we hope, will all roads one day lead to Aligarh. The glory will not be as great, for the old days were the days when poor scholars found their weary feet the best means of locomotion; whereas who knows that before our lukewarm and unwilling supporters give us the wherewithal to found a University, men may not be travelling by means of marconigrams! And is it sane to believe that the spirit of unity moves those of our critics who oppose the creation of a distinctly Mohamedan University, and still advocate the founding of separate institutions for the Musalmans of Bengal, and the Panjab, of Gujerat, and the Deccan, of Madras, and Bombay, because they emphasise the petty, and even mischievous distinctions of different localities? Shall we confide in the wisdom of those who miscall that glory of Aligarh—the distinct type of character evolved by its students in India—"the iron mould," in which we mean to cast the intellect and character of Musalman youths? Behind these rash assertions, false as to what has been, and false as to what shall be, behind the endeavours to fritter away the still remaining energies of a once virile race, behind the desire to split into several insignificant groups a party which it has taken years of patient toil and self-sacrifice to organise, behind the spirit of provincialism that is devoid both of sense and sentiment, and appeals

from religion to political geography, behind that unwillingness to work on one's own account as much as to work in unison with other workers, which justifies the sarcasm of the poet,

زاهد نه خود پیو نه کسي کو پلا سکو کیا بات هے تمهاري شراب طهور کي

is there only a solid mass of nonsense; or is there also that spirit which is expressed by the homely Japanese proverb, "Better be a cock's head than a bull's tail," and to which the poet of the Epic of Man traces the downfall of Lucifer, the Son of the Morning,

"Better to rule in Hell, than serve in Heaven?"

I address my remarks not pointedly to one individual, nor would I accuse even insinuatingly, without more substantial proof, the most violent opponent of our movement. But I must say in as clear tones as possible, and with as much seriousness of warning as I can command, that if we are ever to rise again as a corporate society, let us be on our guard against everything that has the appearance of self-interest and self-aggrandisement; and let us not be comforted by the assurance that any one encounter, no matter how successful, can kill the monster of selfishness. The reptile may only be scotched, not killed.

But after all this that has been thought, and written, and said, what is the net result of our deliberations? Are we one inch nearer the goal that we have selected? Remember, Conferences, and meetings, are only meant for deliberation, exchange of ideas, and the determination of ways and means. Our enthusiasm for Moslem regeneration may begin, but it should not end here. The work, apart from its understanding, still remains undone. And for that no Conferences, Provincial, or Imperial, are necessary. Take with you from this hall the desire to do good to your fellow-beings, and the determination not to be overcome by difficulties. Diffioulties! Why, if there were no difficulties, why should such a large concourse of people meet in every Province, and a still larger concourse of people assemble once a year in some one Province? Listen to our good old friend, Mr. Arnold, a true one if we ever had a true one, and take heart for the future.

"Musalmans all over India have set their hearts on the establishment of a University of their own, and the children of those, at least, who broke down all obstacles to carve out Moslem kingdoms in the land, and set up Empires, are not going to be deterred by

difficulties from achieving victory in the more peaceful field of educational progress. Difficulties indeed! When Syed Ahmad pitched his tent on the site of the old barracks at Aligarh, where the wolves howled at night, and spread out before his friends the plans of his future College, they laughed at his designs as visionary and unpractically ambitious ; but now, now what do we see ?—the Aligarh College is cramped for want of space, and students applying for admission have to be turned away for want of accommodation. The man who desires that the Aligarh College should grow into a University, cherishes no airy, impractical scheme, but one of which a firm and solid foundation has already been laid,—nay, one of which the superstructure has already begun to be built."

The best of Musalmans are on our side ; some of the best men of other races and creeds give strength to our arms by their ardent sympathy ; the rulers of India, both English and Indian, have promised us in word and deed their best support. Shall we be held back by the timidity of those who will neither venture, nor win, who would have us remember that we cannot succeed where a powerful Government has confessedly failed, forgetting that in some enterprises Governments must always fail, and people can often succeed ? At any rate, shall we not say with the poet

کیا فرض ہے کہ سبکو ملے ایک سا جواب آرزو ہم بھی سیر کریں کوہ طور کی

Never was a great thing accomplished, unless a greater one was aimed at. It is only men deluded by lofty errors, duped by illustrious supertititions, and instigated by a thirst for things often beyond their reach, that succeed in doing things worthy of heroes.

دیتے ہیں بادہ ظرف قدح خوار دیکھکر

Shall we fall back because a non-combatant has sounded an alarm ? Or shall we move on, and brave our fate, trusting not to our own rough-hewing, but to the destiny that shapes our ends ? That alone is the question.